

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-18, 20-21, 24-28, 30-31, 34-38, 40-41, 44-48, 50-51, and 54-55 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by Mittra. Claims 10, 23, 33, 43, and 53 were rejected under §103 over Mittra in view of Garrity. Claims 6, 9, 19, 22, 29, 32, 39, 42, 49 and 52 were rejected under §103 over Mittra in view of Dobbins. Claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45, and 55 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office issued a requirement that the Specification be amended to include information regarding cross-referenced applications on page 1. The Office is directed to page 2 of the Amendment filed on 27 July, 2005, in which the Specification was amended in the requested manner. Applicant requests that the Examiner enter those changes if that action was not already taken in response to the previous Amendment.

The Office objected to claim 1 for lack of antecedent basis for the terms “the access device” and “the host device.” Applicant respectfully traverses. The antecedent basis is present in the claim for both terms as follows in bold type:

1. (currently amended) An access control method for an internet television system where each television channel is carried over a different multicast group, and subscribers join a particular multicast group in order to receive a particular channel, the access control method comprising:

distributing multicast group access control information from a distribution device to a **plurality of access devices** for use by the access devices in authenticating subsequent requests **by individual host devices** to join a television channel multicast group in order to reduce delay in authentication when a host device changes television channels, wherein each access device is logically closer to the host device from which the access device receives the request than the distribution device;

receiving, by one of the access devices, a subsequent request by one of the host devices to join the television channel multicast group in order to change television channels;

determining, by the access device, whether the host device is authorized to join the television channel multicast group, and receive a particular television channel, based upon the access control information distributed from the distribution device; and

admitting, by the access device, the host device to the television channel multicast group if and only if the host device is determined to be authorized to join the television channel multicast group,

whereby the access device receives the access control information before it is needed for determining whether the host device is authorized to join the multicast group, thereby facilitating changing channels by reducing authentication delay.

Withdrawal of the objection based on lack of antecedent basis is therefore requested.

Claims 15 and 45 were rejected under §101 based on the Office's new policy for computer software claims. Claim 45 has been amended as suggested by the Office. With regard to claim 15, Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 15 is an apparatus claim which recites tangible parts of a distribution device. It should also be noted that the specification teaches "hardware logic" as a type of logic.¹ Further, Applicant has amended claim 15 to emphasize that the multicast group control information is maintained in memory, and access control information is distributed via an interface. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 under §101 is therefore requested.

With regard to the rejections in view of Mittra and Garrity, the claims as amended distinguish those references. As recited in each of the independent claims, i.e., claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45, and 55, the movement of access control information closer to the host device is done for the purpose of decreasing authentication delay, and thereby making channel changes faster. Mittra makes no mention of this feature, and specifically states that its technique is for the

¹ Page 12, lines 7-12.

purpose of enhancing scalability.² Hence, Mittra teaches away from the presently claimed invention. The combinations of Garrity with Mittra and Dobbins with Mittra were not applied to the independent claims, but it should be noted that both Garrity and Dobbins similarly fail to teach the movement of access control information closer to the host device for the purpose of decreasing authentication delay, and thereby making channel changes faster. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 15, 25, 35, 45, and 55 is therefore requested. Claims 2-14, 16-24, 26-34, 36-44, and 46-54 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of those dependent claims is therefore also requested.

² Col. 13, lines 1-5.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Holmes W. Anderson, Applicants' Attorney, at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. This application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 22, 2006
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-194

Dd: 5/22/2006